

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of	)	Confirmation No.: 5665
	)	
Ken Cameron	)	
	)	Examiner: Asghar H. Bilgrami
Application No.: 10/074,019	)	
	)	Group Art Unit: 2143
Filed: February 14, 2002	)	
	)	
For: METHOD FOR CONTROLLING	)	
THE ORDER OF DATAGRAMS	)	

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

**Mail Stop Amendment**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed on September 25, 2008, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims are respectfully requested, in view of the following remarks:

Substance of the October 27, 2008, and October 28, 2008, Interviews

A personal interview was conducted at the USPTO on October 27, 2008, between the undersigned and Supervisory Patent Examiner Tonia Dollinger. During that interview, the undersigned provided an explanation of the invention and pointed out why the applied Chang et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,338,078) fails to render obvious the claimed invention. More specifically, and as pointed out in further detail below, the undersigned argued why the Office Action failed to provide support in the prior art for the claimed feature of a ticket dispenser, failed to provide reasoning explaining why someone of ordinary skill in the art would modify the Chang et al. system in such as way as to arrive at Applicant's claims, and that the Chang et al. patent actually teaches away from the claimed invention.

Upon review the interview summary issued by Ms. Dollinger on November 4, 2008, the undersigned noted two statements that appear to misrepresent what was actually stated during the interview. Because the undersigned was not provided a copy of the interview summary at the conclusion of the interview, these statements are now addressed: